

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/497,773	02/03/2000	Jerry E. Pierce	22789	7892		
34456	7590 12/30/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER		
TOLER & LARSON & ABEL L.L.P.			CUFF, MICHAEL A			
PO BOX 2956 AUSTIN, TX			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			3627			
			DATE MAILED: 12/30/200	3		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1. 1. <del>1.</del>				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	10
*		09/497,773	PIERCE ET AL.	B
· Office Action Summ	nary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Michael Cuff	3627	
The MAILING DATE of this Period for Reply	communication app	ears on the cover sh et w	ith the correspondence addres.	s
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS CO - Extensions of time may be available under th after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date - If the period for reply specified above is less: - If NO period for reply is specified above, the - Failure to reply within the set or extended per - Any reply received by the Office later than thr earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	DMMUNICATION. e provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 of this communication. than thirty (30) days, a reply maximum statutory period w iod for reply will, by statute, ee months after the mailing	6(a). In no event, however, may a r within the statutory minimum of thir ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this commun BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.
1) Responsive to communicate	ion(s) filed on <u>09 O</u>	<u>ctober 2003</u> .		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	2b)⊠ This a	action is non-final.		
<li>3) Since this application is in c closed in accordance with t</li>				rits is
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>16-41</u> is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are allow 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>16-41</u> is/are reject 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are object 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject	is/are withdraved. ed. ted to.	n from consideration.		
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected 10) The drawing(s) filed on Applicant may not request that Replacement drawing sheet(s)	is/are: a)☐ acce any objection to the o	epted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyar		121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is of	ojected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-1	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and	120			
application from the I  * See the attached detailed Off  13) Acknowledgment is made of since a specific reference was 37 CFR 1.78.  a) The translation of the form	lone of: e priority documents e priority documents d copies of the prior nternational Bureau fice action for a list of a claim for domestic s included in the firs preign language pro-	s have been received. s have been received in A ity documents have been (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not c priority under 35 U.S.C. t sentence of the specific visional application has b c priority under 35 U.S.C.	application No received in this National Stag received. § 119(e) (to a provisional app ation or in an Application Data	olication) a Sheet. ecific
Attachment(s)  1) \[ \sum \] Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		A) Intension 9	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)	
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-692)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PT		5) Notice of I	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Amendment

Applicant's amendment, filed 10/9/03, has been entered and is considered to be responsive. Claims 16-41 are pending.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 26-28, 31-33, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terms "more easily" and "greater likelihood" in claims 26-28, 31-33, and 39-41 are relative terms, which renders the claims indefinite. The specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably appraised of the scope of the invention.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3627

Claims 16-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff in view of Boyle et al.

Wolff shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying that the second word is product related and that the product is associated with restaurant equipment.

Wolff shows, figures 2 and 3, a method and apparatus for facilitating computer network transactions. Host server 12 can be seen in figure 3 to handle transactions (means for tasks of taking an order). Figure 2 shows, embedded within banner 102, is the URL of host server 12 (e.g., "www.bannerbuy.com", central site, a processor, arbitrary word) and a unique indicia (e.g., "12345") identifying the product or service being advertised (descriptive of a product or a service). The indicia is appended to the end of the URL (e.g., "www.bannerbuy.com/12345", appending the arbitrary word to the unique indicia), and the URL is linked to banner 102. The URL and indicia are shown in a dashed box 106 to indicate they are transparent to the user. In other embodiments, the URL and indicia can be displayed to the user, or banner 102 can be replaced by another icon having embedded therein the same URL and indicia. For example, banner 102 can be replaced by a hyperlink including the URL of host server 12 and the indicia of the advertised product or service. Cascaded advertising banner 142 is a second banner similar to banner 102, except that the graphics relate to a second advertised product or service, and the unique identification indicia of that second product or service is appended to the URL of host server 12. At step 246, selection of cascaded banner 142 causes the above-described process to repeat by jumping back to the TCP/IP

request at step 204 using the URL and the unique indicia of the cascaded product or service. Thus, a banner for a second product or service can optionally be cascaded or nested (creating linkage between respective sites and host server) with the first banner depending upon the contents of the retrieved record. Similar nesting may be performed with third, fourth, or any number of additional cascaded banners. In one embodiment, data entered by the user in a preceding transaction is used by host server 12 to automatically fill in corresponding input fields for a cascaded transaction, further helping the user to complete the transaction. The program of the host server 12 is the means for receiving, means for appending, means for establishing, and means for creating.

Boyle et al. teaches, figure 5, a means for labeling URLs using descriptive words in combination with an arbitrary base word in order to provide a more organized and easier to understand network of URLs.

Based on the teaching of Boyle et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify unique numerical indicia of Wolff to incorporate the descriptive words of Boyle et al. in order to provide a more organized and easier to understand network of URLs.

The examiner takes Official Notice that restaurant equipment is a group of products, which can be sold in order to make money.

Based on the discussion above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Wolff system to facilitate transaction for a specific industry (i.e. restaurant equipment) in order to make money.

# R sponse to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/9/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has submitted a declaration and an IDS which shows the commercial success of the use of the invention in the inventor's business. These have been considered.

Applicant asserts that the examiner has not shown where the Boyle reference provides a teaching of a more organized and easier to understand network of URLs. There are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rouffet*, 149 F3d 1350, 1357, 47, USPQ2d 1453, 1457-1458 (Fed. Cir. 1998) In the case of Boyle and Wolff, the examiner's cited motivation falls well within the nature of the problem to be solved and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant asserts that a descriptive product name would require a more complex database search. The examiner does not concur. Applicant is just guessing at the additional complexity. Alpha-numeric searches have been around for a long time. One major benefit to using the product descriptive text would be during troubleshooting. Looking at a database print out with words instead of numbers is much easier to look at (or understand) and troubleshoot.

Art Unit: 3627

Applicant asserts that none of the cited references teach the second website domain name includes the common name portion and a second product name portion.

The examiner does not concur. Boyle teaches this.

Applicant asserts that none of the cited references teach creating a website direct link. The examiner does not concur. Wolff teaches this.

Applicant asserts that none of the cited references teach claims 19 and 23. The examiner does not concur. See rejection.

Applicant asserts that none of the cited references teach the repetitive links for a first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth website. The examiner does not concur. Wolff teaches this.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (703) 308-0610. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9326. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Michael luff 12/29/03 Michael Cuff

December 29, 2003